

APPENDIX F - MITIGATION ANALYSIS

In order to analyze a scenario for the potential future build out of the Plan area we used the Alternative 19 (Referral map) of the County's General Plan update (GP2020). Since this Plan is largely a habitat-based plan, this analysis provides a reasonable approximation of how future discretionary projects will contribute to the preserve system through project mitigation.

The methods for this analysis were to: (1) calculate the number of acres of each vegetation community that is within each GP2020 category both inside and outside PAMA; (2) develop assumptions for how much of any given site is likely to be developed based on its GP2020 category; (3) determine how much on-site open space is likely to contribute for areas within PAMA; (4) determine how much off-site mitigation is likely to be contributed to the preserve system for projects inside and outside PAMA; and (5) total the anticipated mitigation amounts for each vegetation community.

The more specific assumptions and methods for this analysis are as follows:

- This analysis only includes lands in the Plan area.
- Density designations reflect on-the-ground densities in areas currently built to maximum capacity.
- Open space percentage assumed reflects Open Space Subdivision guidelines developed for the General Plan update.
- Riparian areas will achieve a “no net loss” of acreage.
- Density prescribed in GP2020 draft is achievable.
- Mitigation ratios will follow guidelines based on the South County MSCP Subarea Plan for habitat tiers and ratios applied to each tier.
- Vegetation map (2007 update) was used in the analysis.
- Projects currently being processed by the County were not adjusted for the purpose of this analysis, even if proposals do not conform to the GP2020 draft designation.
- Hard-lined projects are not included in this analysis since their mitigation requirements will be known.

The results of this analysis demonstrate that approximately 38,500 acres of natural habitat conservation can reasonably be expected to contribute to the assembly of the preserve system (Table 1).

Table 1. Analysis of future project mitigation toward preserve assembly

	Projected impact inside PAMA *	Projected impact outside PAMA *	In PAMA ratio	Outside PAMA ratio	Resulting conservation in PAMA
Chaparral	12,473	1,840	1.1 ¹	0.55 ¹	13,368
Coastal Sage Scrub	6,395	1,107	1.5	1	8,886
Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral	760	264	1.5	1	1,089
Grassland	3,302	1,788	1	0.5	3,114
Native Grassland	170	6	2	1	346
Montane Coniferous Forest	166	0	2	1	333
Southern Maritime Chaparral	217	3	2	1	438
Woodlands	3,356	676	2	1	7,388
Meadow and Marsh	163	23	2	1	345
Open Water	45	24	2	1	113
Riparian Scrub/Woodland/Forest	1,208	719	2	1	3,135
Agricultural Land	5,141	9,958	0	0	0
Developed/Disturbed Land/Eucalyptus	3,925	13,159	0	0	0
Total	37,321	29,567			38,555

¹Ratios here differ slightly from the ratios outlined in the plan as mitigation ratios for chaparral shown here represent a weighted average (based on frequency of occurrence) that includes non-mafic and mafic chaparral (which has a 2:1 mitigation ratio).

* Projected impact inside and outside PAMA applies to upland habitats. Wetland habitats will be subject to a no net loss policy and therefore are assumed to be 100% conserved within PAMA and 100% avoided (although not managed) outside PAMA.